MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
February 5, 2003
Lansing, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Carmine Palombo, Chairman   Thomas Wieczorek, Vice Chairman
John Kolessar, Member   John Elsinga, Member
Steve Warren, Member   Aaron Hopper, Member

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Zoe Lorca, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

Chairman Palombo called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. in the Bureau of
Aeronautics Auditorium, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the January 8, 2003, Council Minutes

The minutes were moved by Tom Wieczorek and supported by Aaron Hopper.
The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

Correspondence and Announcements

Rick Lilly informed the Council that Charles Krupka had not yet been reappointed
as the Council's Executive Secretary. Carmine Palombo reported that he had
presented the Council's Work Program to the State Transportation Commission
at their January meeting and that they would be considering it at their February
meeting.

Mr. Lilly indicated that the Council website is being established and will initially
contain the minutes of the last meetings. He also indicated that Zoe Lorca would
be working with department staff to ensure that the site was being kept up-to-
date.

Mr. Lilly also reported that copies of the Executive Summary of the State Long
Range Plan had been given to Council members. He reported that new account
codes had been established consistent with the Council's approved budget.

Lastly, Mr. Lilly discussed the option of having the Council meetings outside of Lansing on occasions. After discussion, the following schedule was agreed to:

> ➢ May 7, 2003 – Gaylord
> ➢ June 4, 2003 – Grand Rapids
> ➢ August 6, 2003 – Bay City
> ➢ October 1 – Escanaba
> ➢ November 5 – Southeast Michigan

Chairman Palombo announced that Ms. Gloria Jeff, the new MDOT Director had accepted an invitation to address the Council. He would work with her staff to set a specific date.

Financial Report

Mr. Lilly presented the first monthly report to the Council. The report included the expenditures to date. Steve Warren asked if the monthly reports would be included on the website. Mr. Lilly responded yes. In response to a question by Chairman Palombo, Mr. Lilly indicated who would be receiving the monthly report. This would include the key stakeholders, the Transportation Commission, and the parent agencies. Mr. Wieczorek moved to adopt the report, supported by Mr. Hopper. The motion was approved unanimously.

Committee Reports

Mr. Lilly indicated that the each committee met during the month of January.

1. **Administrative Committee**: Mr. Lilly pointed out that the committee addressed the issue of the reporting date of May 2nd required in the law. The section of Act 51 that relates to the Council's Annual Report states that the report is to be submitted "by" May 2. In another section of Act 51 the county road commissions are required to submit their reports to MDOT "before" May 2. Conceivably a county road commission could submit their report to MDOT on May 1 and be in compliance with that section of the law. However, the Council would not be able to use that information in its report because by May 1 the Council is distributing its report to the Legislature. Mr. Lilly also, pointed out that cities are required to report 120 days after the close of their fiscal year. This means that cities are reporting throughout the year. Consequently, the Council will need to set its own reporting dates in order to keep the data consistent from one year to the next. The Administrative Committee, therefore, is recommending that the reporting period for the Annual Report by from July 1 through June 30. The Council discussed this reporting period and decided that they needed to revisit this issue. Consequently, it was referred back to the Administrative Committee and the Data Management Committee.

2. **Education & Outreach Committee**: Mr. Lilly indicated that there were two items presented by the committee. First, the committee recommended that the Work Program would be generally distributed via the website. Second, the

committee recommended that staff develop a log to keep track of when members and staff were making presentations and to whom. In addition, an audience response sheet should be provided for all speakers.

3. Data Management Committee: The Data Management Committee recommends that data from the National Bridge Inventory be used to determine the condition of the state's bridges. The committee also discussed what would be the appropriate cost figures to use in reporting information regarding projects. Should it be the engineer's estimate, the bid amount, or the final close out? The committee rejected the engineer's estimate because they can change before letting and they rejected the final close out costs because they often are not available for a couple of years after the project is completed. The amount that a project is let for is recommended to be the figure that is used in reporting project costs. Mr. Kolessar noted that sometimes ineligible costs (such as relocating a water main) may be included in the dollar amount let and should the Council accept that as a cost included in the amount reported. The Council agreed that the best number available would be the amount let.

Mr. Lilly then discussed the draft survey and stated that the committee had discussed various alternatives to some of the questions. Mr. Warren indicated that there should be a modification of the questions so that the Council could see how local agencies were using the data. Mr. Lilly indicated that staff would revise the survey based on member comments; get it back to committee members for review; and then work with the Chairman to get the survey started.

4. **Strategic Analysis Committee**: The committee discussed the issue of how the Council should deal with the number of consultants that are interested in showing the Council what they can do for the Council. Currently there are 16 or 17 firms that have contacted Council members or staff and indicated an interest in showing the Council their products. The committee decided that a "request for qualifications" should be developed and sent to those interested in the Council's activities and placed into appropriate trade journals. The committee would then select the top 3 or 4 to interview and receive a more detailed presentation of their products.

Presentation: Michigan Geographic Framework: Rob Surber and Eric Swanson from the Michigan Center for Geographic Information provided a presentation to the Council on the statewide GIS Framework mapping project. The Framework provides a base map upon which any type of road data can be displayed. Mr. Lilly indicated that all Act 51 certification will now be done through using the Framework maps.

General Discussion: Terms and Strategy: This agenda item was delayed until the full Council could be in attendance. It will be scheduled for the first item on the March agenda.

Public Comment: Mr. John Niemela, from the County Road Association of Michigan addressed the Council. He noted that according to the law the regional planning agencies are to provide "technical" assistance to the Council. He said it was important that there be a clear understanding of what this would entail. What specifically would be their role and their relationships with the owners of the systems? Mr. Lilly indicated that the Work Program proposes that the regional planning agencies would serve in a "coordinating" role for the collection of condition data and the list of projects needed for the Multi-Year Program. Mr. Niemela noted that in many areas of the state the local road agencies have little or no contact with the regional planning agencies at this time. There needs to be a period of education in this area. Mr. Warren stressed this point as well.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 p.m.